

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18, and 20 are amended and new claim 21 is presented. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6-14 and 16-21 are pending and under consideration.

## CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18, and 20 are amended, to recite, respectively, an electronic apparatus, a power control apparatus, a method, and an electronic judging apparatus, using claim 1 as an example, including "each unit in said combination of a plurality of units being detachable from said electronic apparatus and exchangeable to a different type unit; and . . . controlling a supply of power . . . based on an aspect of simultaneous operation of each unit in said combination of the plurality of units."

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

## ITEMS 4-9: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 10, 14, AND 20 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIM 6) UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) BY OPRESCU ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,483,656)

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1 (and dependent claim 6) 10, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oprescu.

Independent claims 1, 10, 14, and 20 recite, respectively, an electronic apparatus, a power control apparatus, a method, and an electronic judging apparatus, using claim 1 as an example, including "a judging part judging whether a combination of a plurality of units is to realize a desired function, each unit in said combination. . . being detachable from said electronic apparatus and exchangeable to a different type unit; and a power supply control part controlling a supply of power from a power source to at least one of said units of said combination . . . based on a judgment result of the judging part based on an aspect of simultaneous operation of each unit in said combination of the plurality of units . . . wherein said combination of said plurality of units is determined from the identification information."

Applicant submits that these features are not taught by Oprescu. For example, Oprescu merely teaches (col. 3, starting at line 10) a configuration for controlling a power supply based on an individual operation state of a device in a system in which various devices are connected to a common bus. A power manager, taught by Oprescu (see, for example, col. 4, starting at line 38) accepts or rejects a power usage request sent from each device based on a current power

surplus, e.g., in a case of a disc drive, the power supply is varied when the disc drive is in a standby state and when the disc drive is in a high speed data transmission state. Further, Oprescu teaches (col. 7, starting at line 30) that

each device is a part of a node which includes a dedicated chip (the Physical Interface chip, PHY, described below). The devices power requirements and capabilities are hardwired into the PHY. Upon system initialization the PHY automatically transmits the information over bus 12.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Oprescu does not teach controlling a supply of power based on an aspect of "simultaneous operation" of each unit in said combination of the plurality of units but merely teaches that when the system is initialized the PHY (physical interface chip) provides a power request and a power capacity.

Further, Oprescu does not teach a judging part judging whether a combination of a plurality of units is to realize a desired function where "said combination of a plurality of units being detachable from said electronic apparatus and exchangeable to a different type unit."

(Emphasis added).

In Item 9 of the Action, entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner contends that Oprescu teaches:

where a CPU requires data to be stored on a disk drive (a combination of plurality of units to realize a function). . . determining that a CPU requires data to be stored on a disk drive requires a plurality of units (namely at least the computer with a CPU and the disk drive itself). . . Oprescu teaches that a computer (one of the units) may have numerous power states that the power manager (judging part) must be aware of.

Oprescu teaches . . . the power manager determines (obtains) about how much power (information) is required for a request for specified operation (by the combination of a plurality of units such as storing information on a disk, which requires at least the host and disk drive). Therefore, Oprescu does teach obtaining information of a combination of the plurality of units.

(Action at page 4).

That is, the Examiner incorrectly contends that Oprescu teaches that the computer, itself, and/or CPU are each one of the plurality of units, and that the "judging unit," itself, is one of the units.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's contentions are contradictory. If *arguendo* the CPU is a "judging part" then the CPU can not also be one of the plurality of units, i.e., the CPU is can not be detachable from itself.

Further, Oprescu does not teach a "combination of said plurality of units is determined from the identification information." Oprescu merely teaches identification information is for

identifying a unit, and not for determining the power requirement alone.

**Conclusion**

Since features recited by claims 1, 6, 10, 14 and 20 are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims 1, 6, 10, 14 and 20 allowed.

**ITEMS 11-12: REJECTION OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS 4-5 AND 16-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER OPRESCU, IN VIEW OF CHEN (U.S.P. 5,881,300) AND EXAMINER'S CONTENTED ADMITTED PRIOR ART OF PRESENT APPLICATION PAGE 3, LINES 3-24 (AAPA)**

The Examiner rejects dependent claims 4-5 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu, in view of Chen, and AAPA.

Dependent claims 4-5 and 16-17 recite, respectively, an electronic apparatus, and a method, using claim 4 as an example, including "at least one PC card decoding the information read by the device unit, said judging part identifying a type of said device unit and a type of said PC card, and said power supply control part stopping the supply of power to the PC card when said judging part judges that said device unit does not use said PC card."

Applicant submits that *prima facie* obviousness is not established since features recited by claims 4-5 and 16-17 are not taught by the cited art alone, or in combination. For example, none of the cited art teaches identifying a type of device unit and a type of PC card.

The Examiner contends that Oprescu teaches:

a judging part that identifies a plurality of types (of) device units . . . Oprescu must have and use PC cards in order in order for the device units in communication with the electronic apparatus.

(Action at page 7).

While the Examiner's contention may *arguendo* be so, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not provided any support for his contention that if a unit uses a PC card that it necessarily follows that a judging part identifies the type of PC card stops a supply of power to the card.

**Conclusion**

Since *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims 4-5 and 15-16 allowed.

**ITEMS 16-17: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 7, 11, AND 18 (AND RESPECTIVE DEPENDENT CLAIMS 8-9, 12-13, AND 19) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER OPRESCU IN VIEW OF HIKAWA (U.S.P. 6,678,065) AND KURIHARA**

The Examiner rejects independent claims 7, 11, and 18 (and respective dependent claims 8-9, 12-13, and 19) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu, in view

of Hikawa, and Kurihara.

Independent claims 7, 11, and 18 recite, respectively, an electronic apparatus and power control apparatus, and a method, using claim 7 as an example for an electronic apparatus including "judging whether a combination . . . is a predetermined combination, each unit in said combination of a plurality of units being detachable from said electronic apparatus and exchangeable to a different type unit; and . . . stopping a supply of power to at least one unit in the combination when said judging part judges . . . based on an aspect of simultaneous operation of each unit in said combination of the plurality of units." (Emphasis added).

Applicant submits that these features are not taught by the cited art alone, or in combination. That is, none of the cited art, alone or in combination, teaches a separate part that judges whether "each unit in said combination . . . being detachable . . . and exchangeable to a different type unit"; and a judging that the combination is a predetermined combination based on an aspect of "simultaneous operation" of each unit in said combination of the plurality of units.

Hikawa, for example, merely teaches an electronic apparatus having a combination of units.

#### **Conclusion**

Since *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims 7-9, 11-13, and 18-19. 21.

#### **NEW CLAIM**

New claim 21 is presented to recite features in an alternate fashion.

Claim 21 recites a method including "stopping a supply of power to one of the plurality of units based on an aspect of simultaneous operation of the units."

These and other features of claim 21 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

#### **CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 21, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501